PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

REC'D 0 4 APR 2005

• Crom the				Loop	
From the NTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	٦	TO COM	WIPO	PC	
To: J. PETER FASSE FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 225 FRANKLIN STREET BOSTON, MA 02110-2804	WRI INTERNATIO	PCI TTEN OPINION			
		(PCT Rule 43bi	s.1)		
	Date of mailing (day/month/year)	01 APR 2	005		
Applicant' s or agent's file reference	FOR FURTHER	ACTION See paragraph 2 belo	ow .		
07917-251WO1 International filing day	ate (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/	month/year)	-	
10 November 2004 (21 November 2003	3 (21.11.2003)		
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification	fication and IPC				
IPC(7): C12Q 1/68; C12N 15/63 and US Cl.: 435/6, 455					
Applicant					
U. MASSACHUSETTS				=	
1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following	items:				
Box No. I Basis of the opinion					
Box No. II Priority	Box No. II Priority				
Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with	th regard to novelty, in	ventive step and indu	strial applicability		
Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention					
Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement					
Box No. VI Certain documents cited					
Box No. VII Certain defects in the internation	1 lication				
Box No. VIII Certain observations on the inter	rnational application				
2. FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.					
If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.					
	3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.				
Name and mailing address of the ISA/US	Authorized of	1110000	z yakk	S	
Mail Stop PCT, Atm: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents	Michael D. I				
P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	Telephone No	o. (571) 272-2915			

Facsimile No. (703) 305-3230
Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (January 2004)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.	
PCT/US04/38950	

Box No. I Basis of this opinion					
1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which is true filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.					
This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).					
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:					
a. type of material					
a sequence listing					
table(s) related to the sequence listing					
b. format of material					
in written format					
in computer readable form					
c. time of filing/furnishing					
contained in international application as filed.					
filed together with the international application in computer readable form.					
furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.					
In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.					
4. Additional comments:					

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No. PCT/US04/38950

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

	approach; transactions and expandences are perfectly and a seriometer				
1.	Statement				
	Novelty (N)	Claims 7, 9-17	YES		
		Claims <u>1-6, 8</u>	NO		
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims 7, 9-17	YES		
		Claims <u>1-6, 8</u>	NO		
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-17	YES		
		Claims NONE	NO		

2. Citations and explanations:

Claim 1 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Mansell et al. The intended use of the instant claims ("for use in the treatment of acute pancreatitis") is not given patentable weight in this consideration. Mansell et al disclose THP-1 or HEK 293 cells expressing TLR4 that are treated with the serpin antithrombin III. This treatment blocks NF-kB activation via the TRL4 pathway. See the abstract, second full paragraph, second column, pg. 313, and Fig. 4, pg. 315.

Claim 1 lacks novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Yoshimura et al. The intended use of the instant claims ("for use in the treatment of acute pancreatitis") is not given patentable weight in this consideration. Yoshimura et al disclose a decrease in TRL4 activity in response to LPS from *P. gingivalis* and *C. ochracea*. This treatment blocks NF-kB activation via the TRL4 pathway. See the abstract, Fig. 1, page 220 and Fig. 3, pg. 221.

Claims 1 and 8 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Su et al. The intended use of the instant claims ("for use in the treatment of acute pancreatitis") is not given patentable weight in this consideration. Su et al disclose a monoclonal antibody to TLR4 that inhibits LPS-induced TLR4 pathway. See the abstract, paragraph bridging first and second columns page 3498, and Fig. 4, pg. 3499.

Claims 1 and 8 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Hatakeyama et al. The intended use of the instant claims ("for use in the treatment of acute pancreatitis") is not given patentable weight in this consideration. Hatakeyama et al disclose a monoclonal antibody to TLR4 that inhibits the TLR4 pathway. See the abstract, paragraphs bridging first, second and third columns page 19, and Fig. 5, pg. 19.

Claims 1-6 and 8 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Arditi et al. The intended use of the instant claims ("for use in the treatment of acute pancreatitis") is not given patentable weight in this consideration. Arditi et al disclose methods for inhibiting the activity of TLR4 using antisense RNA or siRNA molecules that inhibit the expression of TLR4, proteins that compete with TLR4 ligands (such as MD-2), or TLR4 antibodies. See pages 5-8.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE

International application No.

11/11	ERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY	PC17US04/38950				
Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application					
The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:						
supported by the	description, are made:					
	8					